

## REMARKS

The above amendments are made in response to the outstanding Non-final Office Action mailed on September 11, 2008. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks

Claims 11, 19, 35, 41, 50 and 51 have been amended to more clearly define the subject matter of the claimed invention. Claims 38-40, 52-56 and 65-67 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of the allowability of Claims 28-31, 40-43 and 51.

### Objection to Drawings

The drawings of this application stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) because they fail to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner has stated that in Claim 35 the limitation "a width of an insertion hole being gradually increased from a lower end to an upper end" must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim.

Applicant has amended Claim 35 to delete the above limitation.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the amended Claim 35 and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 11-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has stated that the term “bogie” appears to refer to different bogies, but using the same nomenclature to recite different structures is indefinite.

In this regard, Applicant has amended Claims 19, 50 and 51 to differentiate the bogies having different function, using terms “automatic bogie,” “first moving bogie,” “second moving bogie,” and “third moving bogie.” The automatic bogie and first moving bogie have different functionalities, which are clearly explained in pages 52 and 53, and Figures 7, 8 and 14 of this application. Further, the second and third moving bogies, which are different from the automatic and first moving bogies, also have different functions, which are described in page 83 and Figures 42 and 43 of this application.

Applicant therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the amended Claims 19, 50 and 51 and withdraw the rejection on the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 11-13, 24, 38, 39, 44-46, 52, 53, 55, 56, 62-64, 66 and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young (U.S. Patent No. 3,543,952).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 28-31, 40-43 and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base and intervening claims.

Among the above allowable claims, Claim 40 is dependent indirectly from Claim 11 through Claims 38 and 39. Applicant has amended Claim 11 to incorporate all the limitations of Claims 38-40, which are now cancelled. Claim 41 has been amended to change its dependency due to cancellation of Claims 38-40. Claims 52-53, 55, 56, 66 and 67 have been further

Application No. 10/563,142  
Response dated: December 5, 2008  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of: September 11, 2008

cancelled, leaving that Claim 11 is independent and Claims 12-13, 24, 44-46 and 62-64 are dependent directly or indirectly from Claim 11.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Young does not anticipate the amended Claim 11 by including the allowable subject matter of Claims 38-39. Claims 12-13, 24, 44-46 and 62-64 are also believed not anticipated by the Young reference, by virtue of their direct or indirect dependency from the amended Claim 11.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to review these submissions and withdraw the rejection on the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 14, 15, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young and further in view of Alsen (U.S. Patent No. 3,754,669).

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young and further in view of Alsen and further in view of Roe Woodruff (U.S. Patent No. 1,703,978).

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young and Alsen and further in view of Fantuzzi (U.S. Patent No. 5,951,226).

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young and Alsen and Fantuzzi and further in view of Dobner (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,990).

Claims 25-27, 32-37, 54, 60, 61 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Albert Sahlin (U.S. Patent No. 2,316,976) and Sanders (U.S. Patent No. 2,848,069).

Claims 47-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 4,955,489).

In response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 54 and 65. Claims 14-22, 25-27, 32-37, 47-50, 60 and 61 are dependent directly or indirectly from the amended Claim 11.

Application No. 10/563,142  
Response dated: December 5, 2008  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of: September 11, 2008

As discussed above in connection with the 102 rejection, Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claims 38-40.

It is therefore submitted that the amended Claim 11 is allowable over the cited references, by means of recitation of the allowable subject matter. Claims 14-22, 25-27, 32-37, 47-50, 60 and 61 are also believed to be allowable over the cited references, by virtue of their direct or indirectly dependency from the amended Claim 11.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to review these submissions and withdraw the rejection on the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 28-31, 40-43 and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base and intervening claims.

As noted above, all the limitations of Claim 40 (including intervening Claims 38 and 39) have been incorporated into Claim 11.

Claims 28-31, 41-43 and 51 are now dependent directly or indirectly from the amended Claim 11.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 28-31, 41-43 and 51 are allowable as they stand, by their direct or indirect dependency from the amended Claim 11.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and subsequent allowance of this application are courteously requested.

Application No. 10/563,142  
Response dated: December 5, 2008  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of: September 11, 2008

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number with any questions or comments regarding this Response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP

By: /Jaegyoo Jang /  
Jaegyoo Jang  
Limited Recognition No. L0469

Date: December 5, 2008  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 510  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone: (703) 236-4500  
Facsimile: (703) 236-4501